

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 180561

61  
ORIGIN ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 DODE-00 NSC-05 /082 R

DRAFTED BY ACDA/IR:LFISCHER

APPROVED BY ACDA/IR:ACFLOYD

C:KELLY

UR/RPM:DJONES

PM/DCA:CFLOWEREE

CDA/IR:THIRSCHFELD

NSC:MHIGGINS

DSD:JMORRISON

JCS:RMCCANN

S/S:O P. JOHNSON

----- 011308

O R 310020Z JUL 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY BONN

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T STATE 180561

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, MBFR, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: JULY 24 SPC DISCUSSION OF GUIDANCE AND  
SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDINGS

REFERENCE: NATO 3925

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 180561

DELIVER DURING WORKING HOURS

1. WE HAVE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON GUIDANCE REQUESTED IN  
PARA 14 REFTEL.

2. WE CAN ACCEPT WORDS "NUCLEAR REDUCTION PACKAGE" AS SUBSTITUTE FOR "OPTION III" WHEREVER THAT TERM APPEARS IN TEXTS.

3. FRG ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING (PARA 4, REFTEL).

A. ON POINT A, WE EXPECT AN EARLY EXCHANGE OF DATA WITH THE EAST. WE WILL MAKE OUR BEST EFFORTS TO ELEICT SUCH AN EXCHANGE. WE WOULD HAVE NO OBJECTION TO INCLUSION OF A FORMULATION ALONG THE LINES OF THE FIRST SENTENCE ABOVE IN THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDING OR IF THE ALLIES

PREFER, IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, BUT WE NOTE THAT NATO HAS NOT IN THE PAST IMPOSED ANY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EAST-WEST AGREEMENT ON DATA AS A CONDITION FOR AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THERE IS A DEMONSTRATED NEED TO IMPOSE SUCH A REQUIREMENT SPECIFICALLY AS PART OF OPTION III. AS NOTED IN STATE 176496, WE BELIEVE REQUIRING EAST-WEST UNDERSTANDING ON THE POST-PHASE I DATA BASE, WHICH WOULD REVEAL EXACT DISPARITES IN MAN-POWER AND TANKS, COULD BE AS DIFFICULT TO NEGOTIATE AS REQUIRING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO A NUMERICALLY SPECIFIC COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING. AS ALSO NOTED IN STATE 176496, WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT SETTING A SPECIFIC NUMERICAL LEVEL FOR THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN PHASE I WOULD UNDESIRABLY REDUCE ALLIED FLEXIBILITY IN SETTING THE EXACT SIZE OF ALLIED REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II, AND MIGHT ENCOURAGE EASTERN PRESSURE FOR NATIONAL COMMITMENTS TO PHASE II REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I.

B. WE CAN AGREE THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD REQUIRE EASTERN UNDERSTANDING THAT THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING WOULD BE COLLECTIVE. ON THE OTHER HAND WE BELIEVE IT INADVISABLE TO INTRODUCE ISSUES RELATED TO THE FORM OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN THIS CONTEXT. WE COULD THEREFORE NOT AGREE TO INCLUSION OF THE SECOND PHRASE OF POINT B IN THE

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 180561

SUPPLEMENT.

C. ON POINT C, FOR REASONS NOTED ABOVE, WE BELIEVE IT IS UNDESIRABLE FOR ALLIES TO ATTEMPT TO DECIDE NOW, IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDINGS, WHAT THE EXACT LEVEL OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING SHOULD BE, AND THEREFORE, THE EXACT SIZE OF ALLIED PHASE II REDUCTIONS.

D. WE ALSO DO NOT AGREE THAT AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE FOR THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING SHOULD BE NECESSARILY AGREED WITH THE EAST IN PHASE I. REQUIRING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO EVEN AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE FOR THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN PHASE I WOULD RAISE THE SAME ISSUES INVOLVED

IN REQUIRING AGREEMENT TO A SPECIFIC FIGURE. WE BELIEVE IT SUFFICIENT FOR ALLIED PURPOSES (NAMELY, TO PROVIDE SOME KIND OF LIMIT TO ALLIED REDUCTIONS) IF THIS ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE WAS INCLUDED IN THE ALLIED OPTION III PRESENTATION, REFLECTED IN THE NEGOTIATING RECORD AND NOT EXPLICITLY CHALLENGED BY THE EAST. THE EAST IS FULLY AWARE OF THE GENERAL MAGNITUDE OF REDUCTIONS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT FOR PHASE II. MOREOVER, WE AGREE WITH DUTCH COMMENT (PARA 3, REFTEL) THAT EAST IS UNLIKELY TO SERIOUSLY SEEK A SUBSTANTIALLY LOWER COMMON CEILING LEVEL BECAUSE THIS WOULD INCREASE THEIR REDUCTIONS.

AND WE NOTE THAT CM(73)83, PARA 12, ALREADY RECORDS ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE ALLOWABLE SIZE OF GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS. MISSION SHOULD MAKE ABOVE COMMENTS, INCLUDING POINTS IN PARAS 3 AND 4 OF STATE 176496.

4. UK PROPOSAL ON DATA (PARA 4, REFTEL). MISSION SHOULD OPPOSE THIS PROPOSAL DRAWING ON RELEVANT POINTS IN PARA 3 ABOVE. ALTHOUGH THIS QUESTION IS AN IMPORTANT ONE FOR THE ALLIANCE, WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS RELATED TO THE OPTION III PROPOSAL ALONE AND AGREEMENT ON DATA SHOULD NOT BE TIED TO OPTION III.

5. FRG PROPOSED INSERT IN SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDINGS (PARA 5, REFTEL). GUIDANCE IN PREPARATION.

6. UK PROPOSED INSERT IN SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDING  
SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 180561

(PARA 7, REFTEL). WE ASSUME UK DID NOT INTEND THIS LANGUAGE TO PREJUDICE POSSIBLE MODIFICATION OF ALLIED GUIDANCE (PARA 20, STATE 169248) TO ALLOW ALLIES TO TAKE "CREDIT" FOR THE POSSIBLE REDUCTION OF US AIR PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH THE F-4'S TO BE WITHDRAWN. WITH THAT UNDERSTANDING, WE CAN ACCEPT NEW UK PARA.

7. FRG AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDINGS (PARA 9, SUBPARAS A AND C, REFTEL). WE CAN ACCEPT THE TWO FRG PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT. HOWEVER, YOU SHOULD INDICATE TO UK AND FRG THAT WE WILL PRIVATELY DISCUSS WITH THEM FURTHER THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SECOND CHANGE. (PARA 9C REFTEL) MISSION SHOULD ASK FRG REP FOR FURTHER EXPLANATION OF PROBLEMS REGARDING PARA 20 OF SUPPLEMENT (PARA 9D REFTEL).

8. FRG DESIRE FOR GREATER PRECISION IN HOW NEGOTIATING RECORD WOULD REFLECT AIRCRAFT MODELS COVERED BY NUCLEAR-CAPABLE DEFINITION. THE SENTENCE OF THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY UNDERSTANDINGS (PARA 11, STATE 169248) FOLLOWING THAT BRACKETED BY THE FRG SUGGESTED, AS ONE POSSIBLE APPROACH, AGREEMENT BY BOTH SIDES ON A LIST OF

THOSE MODELS WHICH ARE COVERED. WE WOULD WELCOME FRG VIEWS BUT WE BELIEVE ALTERNATIVES SHOULD NOT BE FORECLOSED.

9. NETHERLANDS DESIRE FOR GREATER PRECISION IN DEFINING WHAT SOVIET NUCLEAR INCREASES WOULD BE PROHIBITED. WE UNDERSTAND ALLIES DESIRE FOR GREATER SPECIFICITY. BUT, WE ARE NOT CONVINCED THE ALLIANCE NEEDS TO DECIDE THIS ISSUE IN ADVANCE OF INITIAL NEGOTIATION WITH THE EAST. MISSION MAY DRAW ON PARA 43 OF THE US VIEWS PAPER FOR

ARGUMENTATION. FYI WASHINGTON CONTINUES TO STUDY THIS ISSUE FOR POSSIBLE FURTHER ELABORATION :ND FYI.

10. REGARDING PARA 10, REFTEL, MISSION SHOULD REMAIN FIRM ON US POSITION REGARDING LANGUAGE IN PARA 3 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE THAT NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON GROUND FORCES. INGERSOLL

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 26 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL, AGREEMENT DRAFT, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, GUIDANCE INSTRUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 31 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** greeneet  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE180561  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** ACDA/IR:LFISCHER  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** D750263-0855  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197507107/baaaaqth.tel  
**Line Count:** 183  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** greeneet  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 04 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <04 APR 2003 by lzenbel0>; APPROVED <07 OCT 2003 by greeneet>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** n/a  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, SPC, MBFR  
**To:** NATO INFO LONDON  
BONN  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006